

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the subject application are respectfully requested in light of the comments which follow.

Claims 45-67 were pending in this application, of which claims 47, 58 and 60-67 were withdrawn from consideration. In this response, claims 45, 48, 61, and 67 are amended, and no claim is canceled or added. Thus, claims 45-67 remain pending.

Applicants have submitted amendments without prejudice to or disclaimer of the canceled subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional or continuation application on any subject matter canceled by way of amendment. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found, for example, in at least the following locations in the original disclosure: the original claims and the specification, page 20, lines 5-6.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, because the Amendment places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration; does not present any additional claims; and places the application in better form for an appeal should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented, because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the Amendment, reexamination and further and favorable reconsideration of the subject application in light of the following remarks, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, are thus respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 37 C.F.R. § 103

Claims 45-46, 49-50, 52-57 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Epaillard et al. “*Makromolekulare Chemie, 189(5) (1988), pp. 1035-1042*” (hereafter “*Epaillard*”) on the grounds set forth at pages 3-4 of the Office Action. The Office alleges that *Epaillard* discloses curing an acrylate compound by cold plasma. *Epaillard* allegedly discloses that plasma initiators can be added to the coating to increase the polymerization rate induced by the plasma. One of the initiators disclosed in *Epaillard* is darocur 1116 (D1116). The Office alleges that D1116 is described in the chemical abstract as 2-hydroxy-2-methyl-1-[4-(1-methylethyl)phenyl]-1-propanone, which allegedly falls within the scope of formula I as originally claimed in claim 45.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent the rejection is applied to the newly amended claims. Claim 45 now recites that R₂ in formula I is OR₅ or NR₇R₈, where “R₅ is selected from the group consisting of hydrogen, C₁-C₁₂alkyl, C₁-C₁₂alkenyl, phenyl, benzyl, Si(CH₃)₃, and $-\left[C_aH_{2a}X\right]_bR_{10}$, if and only if, R₁ and R₃, together with the carbon atom to which they are bonded, form a cyclohexyl ring; or R₅ is selected from the group consisting of C₁-C₁₂alkyl, C₁-C₁₂alkenyl, phenyl, benzyl, Si(CH₃)₃ or $-\left[C_aH_{2a}X\right]_bR_{10}$, if and only if, R₁ and R₃, together with the carbon atom to which they are bonded, do not form a cyclohexyl ring.” D1116 does not fall within the scope of formula I as currently recited in claim 45, at least because D1116 does not include R₂ as recited in claim 45.

Further, *Epaillard* provides no rationale for modifying D1116. Instead, *Epaillard* discloses four different initiators having no common chemical structure as potential initiators. Further, *Epaillard* fails to disclose any particular advantage to any one of the four initiators

mentioned. *Epaillard* merely discloses that there is an improvement in polymerization rate when any of the initiators is added compared to a coating without an initiator. *See, e.g.*, p. 5, lines 7-23. Therefore, *Epaillard* provides no reason to select D1116 for modification. Further, even if selected, there is no reason to substitute the hydroxyl group of D1116 with either OR₅ or NR₇R₈ as currently recited in claim 45.

For at least the reasons above, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established for claim 45. Dependent claims 46, 48-57, 59-60, and 67, which depend from claim 45, are also not obvious for at least the reasons set forth for claim 45.

Claims 48, 51 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over *Epaillard* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0129322 to Kunz et al. (hereafter “*Kunz*”) on the grounds set forth at page 5 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 48, 51, and 59 each depend on claim 45. As presented above, *Epaillard* at least fails to render obvious all of the elements recited in claim 45. Further, *Kunz* appears to be relied upon by the Office solely for elements recited in claims 48, 51, or 59, respectively. *Kunz* fails to remedy at least the deficiencies of *Epaillard*. For example, *Kunz* also fails to disclose a photolatent compound as currently recited in claim 45. Therefore, for at least this reason no combination of *Epaillard* and *Kunz* renders obvious all of the elements recited in claims 48, 51, or 59. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that any issues remain, it is requested that the undersigned be contacted so that any such issues may be adequately addressed and prosecution of the instant application expedited. Applicants' representative is signing in his capacity under 37 C.F.R. §1.34 on behalf of Applicants.

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Date: October 29, 2010

By: Christopher P. Bruenjes
Christopher P. Bruenjes
Reg. No. 62,941

DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005-1209
Tel: (202) 842-8800
F: (202) 842-8465